IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 20TH JUNE 2007 / 30TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 14591 of 2007(K)

PETITIONER:

C.K.AJITH, HYOTHI BHAVAN,
CMC-15, CHERTHALA.

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
ALAPPUZHA, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

2. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, ALAPPUZHA.

3. THE DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER,
K.S.R.T.C, ALAPPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI.K.PRABHAKARAN, SC, K.S.R.T.C.
GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.ANU SIVARAMAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 20/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX IN WPC NO.14591/2007

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1:- TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 30/5/2006

EXT.P2:- TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 30/10/2006 IN M.V.A.A.NO.491/2006.

EXT.P3:- TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 2/12/2006.

EXT.P4:- TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 9/2/2007.

[TRUE COPY] PA TO JUDGE

S.SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.P.(C)No. 14591 of 2007

Dated this the 20th day of June, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner submits that the petitioner's application for regular permit has not been attended to by the R.T.A. Therefore, the petitioner seeks a direction to the 1st respondent to consider the petitioner's application and to pass orders thereon. The petitioner is a stage carriage operator who applied for a regular permit which was rejected by Exhibit.P1 order of the 1st respondent. The petitioner filed an appeal before the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, which was allowed by Ext.P2 judgment and the 1st respondent was directed to consider the matter afresh in case the petitioner modifies the route within a month. The contention of the petitioner is that proper application modifying the route has been submitted before the 1st respondent, who has not attended to the same till date. I have heard the submissions of the Learned Counsel for the petitioner as also the Learned Government Pleader. The Learned Government Pleader submits that the matter was placed before

the R.T.A who adjourned the same for a report as to whether the route overlaps any notified route. Government Pleader further submits that the matter would be placed before the next RTA meeting. This writ petition is disposed of directing the 1st respondent to consider the matter in the next R.T.A meeting.

S.SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

ma